

A
PLAIN and RATIONAL
ACCOUNT
OF THE
Law of the Sabbath ;

BEING

A DEFENCE of a late PAMPHLET, in-
titled, *The Fourth Commandment abrogated
by the Gospel:*

OR,

An ANSWER to Mr. ROBERT CORN-
THWAITE's *farther Defence of the Seventh-
day Sabbath :*

In which Gen. ii. 2, 3. (called by him the ORIGINAL INSTITUTION,) is more particularly con-
sider'd; and his most material OBJECTIONS and
CRITICISMS refuted.

In a LETTER to Mr. CORNTHWAITE.

By CALEB FLEMING,
Author of *The Fourth Commandment abrogated by
the Gospel.*

*They shall observe no such thing as is required by the Law of Mo-
ses, save only abstaining from fornication, blood, things strang-
led, and meat offer'd to idols; the saying these four things only
shall be excepted, is the same as saying that the observation of
the Sabbath is not excepted, because it is not mention'd among
the Exceptions. See Hallet's Study of the Scriptures, p. 172.
and the Decree of the Jerusalem Council, Acts. xv. 28, 29.*

L O N D O N ;

Printed for D. FARMER, at the Bible, in Pater-Noster-Row ;
R. FORD, at the Angel, in the Poultry; H. WHITRIDGE,
under the Royal-Exchange; and A. DODD, at the Peacock,
without Temple-Bar. M.DCC.XXXVI. (Price 1s.)

PLAN and RATIONAL
ACCOUNT

Law of the Sabbath;

A DEFENCE of a new PAMPHLET
ON THE
SABBATH

AN ANSWER to the
THIRTY-THIRD
ARTICLE

OF THE
DECLARATION OF THE
SABBATH

IN A LETTER to Mr. CORNWALLIS.

By
Author of the
SABBATH

THE
SABBATH

THE
SABBATH



S I R,

IN reading over your Letter, called, the *Seventh-day Sabbath* farther vindicated,——against the Exceptions of the Author of the fourth Commandment abrogated by the Gospel, I determin'd to reconsider the Controversy, and to examine whether what I had wrote wou'd bear a *Defence*; I was soon convinced that it would. I am likewise of opinion, that the manner in which you have wrote your *Vindication*, does in some measure make it fit that I should reply.

The Argument in debate between us, I apprehend stands thus; You say, That the seventh day of the Week, which we call *Saturday*, is the Christian Sabbath; but the Christian Sabbath, you say, *p. 2. l. 18.* you do not pretend to build on the fourth Commandment; and yet you have something else on which you build the Christian Sabbath; which, if I understand you, is, what you call the original Institution of the Sabbath, *Gen. ii. 2, 3. viz. God's resting on the seventh day, and blessing and sanctifying it.*

On the other hand, I have undertook to prove that the Law of the seventh day Sabbath was a temporary precept, of a positive nature, and only binding to the *Jews*: and that *Christians* with

greatest propriety observe the *first day* of the Week as a Festival; it being the day on which *Christ Jesus* arose from the dead; and that his *Resurrect* on was undoubtedly the most important Event to Christians.

Now, since you build on that Text in *Genesis* as your main foundation, it shall be the business of my *first Section* to give a more particular explanation of it; in which I shall shew, that it does not prove that the seventh day was appointed to be observed as a Sabbath; and that the seventh day Sabbath was not in observation till the time of *Moses*.

II. That the Sabbath was not an ordinance of a *moral* nature; but a merely positive Institution, and confin'd to the *Jewish* State. And

III. Prove the abrogation or repeal of the Sabbath, from the Apostle *Paul*, and other topicks; and under this head, answer some objections made to the repeal.

IV. I shall shew, that the *first day* of the week was observed by the Church in the Apostles days; and endeavour a confutation of your pretence, that the seventh day of the week was observed as a Sabbath by the primitive Christians.

V. I shall offer some reasons to prove that the *first day* of the Week has, with the greatest propriety been kept in honour of our Saviour's Resurrection; and that an expresse Command is not necessary to justify such an observance.

SECTION.

S E C T. I.

An Explication of Genesis ii. 2, 3.

THE words run thus, *On the seventh day God ended his work, which he had made, and he rested the seventh day from all his work which he had made; and God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because, that in it he had rested from all his work which God had created and made.* In the words there are these things observable, viz. the Being that rested; the nature of the rest; the import of blessing and sanctifying: from whence I shall examine how it appears to be a *Law* on which we may build the Sabbath; more especially the *Christian Sabbath*, or rather, the *Christian Festival*.

I might enlarge very much on what you say, p. 5. viz. "That my representing the Being that rested as the *Logos*, and not the Supreme Being, is an opinion not only contrary to the general consent of learned Men, but also to reason, and revelation." But as this don't so much concern the grand point in debate, I shall do little more than refer my Readers to the two texts you have mention'd; viz. *Ephes. iii. 9.* and *Psalms cxxxvi. beg.* That it was the God of Gods—who by his *Wisdom* made the Heavens:— and leave it with any attentive person to judge, whether God's creating all things *by Jesus Christ*, and his making the Heavens *by his Wisdom*, does at all contradict what I had offer'd: or, whether in a revelation made of the *operations, nature, and will* of the one underived Being, it is not highly congruous to reason, that the Being by whom such declaration and discovery was made, shou'd not be first mentioned, as being *he* from whom we received that

revelation; and especially, when any thing is ascribed to the Being mention'd, which will not bear an application to the *underived* Being, as is the case before us.—But I proceed,

In p. 8. “ You charge me with an *egregious perversion of the text*, and with *boldly reading* the words “ of the precept thus, *For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that therein is, and rested the seventh day*; by which resting, he blessed and hallowed it; *i. e.* that day on which he rested: and thus you say, that I confine the divine blessing and sanctification of the seventh day to that individual seventh day on which he *first* rested from the work of creation.”

By his *first resting*, you must undoubtedly mean that he continued his resting longer than that individual seventh day lasted; or, that he has had other intervals of rest since; and if so, it will be necessary, in order to give his example the force of a Law, that we know whether those other periods of rest were on any, or, on every succeeding seventh day.—I proceed to observe, that it appears in the light I have put it from the very face of the precept; *For in six days the Lord made heaven, &c. and rested the seventh day, WHEREFORE the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.* Now nothing is plainer than that this resting the seventh day, made it a Sabbath day; for, had he not rested, it cou'd have been no Sabbath: and it farther appears, that as his *blessing* and *hallowing* has not any thing for an antecedent, but his having finished his work, or, his resting, it will follow, that his resting on the seventh day, was the occasion and reason of, or rather, was the blessing and hallowing. This being the case, it lies upon you, *Sir*, to prove, that any other seventh day was sanctified by God, on the same reason; or, that on any other seventh day, he could

could be said to rest from his work, with the same propriety that it is here said that he rested; which *resting* was the reason of his blessing and hallowing; or, did truly bless and hallow.

You may perhaps say, if this be true, how cou'd this be urged as a reason or motive to the *Jews*, for their observance of a weekly seventh day Sabbath 2500 years after?

To which I shall give the following solution: It does not appear that the conformity and resemblance lay in this, *viz.* in God's resting every seventh day, and working the other six; for if it had, this wou'd have been expressed: on the contrary, it is evidently confin'd to that single seventh day on which he rested, from the six days work of Creation not being repeated. The view which the Creator seems to have had in adding this *motive* or reason to the observance of the *Sabbath* was, that as this was to be a SIGN between God and the People of *Israel*, throughout their Generations: so, as the seventh day (marked out by the giving of Manna,) tallied with the seventh day God rested from Creation, therefore it was added as a strong and clear intimation, that he who brought them out of *Egypt* by the Angel of his presence, was the Creator of Heaven and Earth. Besides, the time of their Sabbath being the time of God's finishing his work, as well as the time separated as an acknowledgment of God's delivering them from *Egyptian* bondage, settles at once the Redeemer of the People of *Israel*, and the Creator of Heaven and Earth, to be one and the same *Being*; and contains the strongest motive against their falling into Idolatry. This is farther confirm'd by the Preface of the ten Commandments; nay, the evident design of the first four Commandments is to secure the homage of the *Jews* to the one supreme God: and of the fourth Com-

Commandment it is expressly said, that it was given to keep alive both the remembrance of their bondage, and that it was the Lord God who deliver'd them. See *Deut. v. 15. And remember that thou wast a Servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence,—therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath-day.*

Again; the ultimate *design, reason, and spirit* of the Command, was not that they shou'd follow the example of the Creator, in their resting on that same seventh day in the revolution of it from the Creation; but that they shou'd accommodate their days of *work and rest*, to the days of God's *working and resting*: for the resemblance apparently lies between God's *work and rest*, and their *work and rest*, the force of the *Example* not lying in the individuality of the day, but in the resemblance of *working and resting*. And therefore all arguments taken from the morality of *Example in days answering to one another*, seem inconclusive: but the resemblance between God, and the *Jews*, lay in working six days, and resting the seventh; which appears to be all the conformity, or proportionality which the fourth Commandment established.

But farther, the rest enjoin'd on the seventh day in the fourth Commandment, is a total Cessation from Labour; and its sanctification is no otherwise expressed than by its being distinguish'd from other days, as a day of rest; (so it is in *Gen. ii.*) Now if other days were not holy, because they might be employ'd in the uses of Life, and for the support of it; or because the Creator display'd, and excited his creating power thereon; then the *Sanctification*, which expresses the contrary to this, must be *the cessation of that labour*: and cannot but be understood as the true reason why the others were not holy also.

To

To *sanctify* or *hallow*, in the Mosaic Style or Idiom, did not intend any degree of *real* holiness imparted by such sanctifying and hallowing, *i. e.* that the thing so sanctified or hallowed became any way alter'd, or changed in its nature, or qualities; which will appear from the following passages.

Lev. viii. 10, 11, 12. And Moses took the anointing oil, and anointed the Tabernacle, and all that was therein, and SANCTIFIED them. And he sprinkled thereof upon the altar seven times, and anointed the altar and all his vessels, both the laver, and his foot, to SANCTIFY them. And he poured of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head, and anointed him to SANCTIFY him. comp. Exod. xxix. 21.

From whence we may observe, that the Tabernacle, and its vessels; and *Aaron*, and his Sons, and their Garments, all underwent a like application, in order to their Sanctification; and intended no more than a separation for such and such Services.

Thus the *Israelites resting* made holy or separated and distinguished the day on which they rested, from those days on which they worked; and with great propriety did so, when they understood that such separation was the subject of a divine Command; inasmuch as such conformity and obedience became an act of Religion. Again, when *Moses* tells us, *Gen. ii.* that God *blessed* and *sanctified* the seventh day, he says no more, than that he did it by his ceasing from Creation on that day: and that this his different conduct thereon, made it thus differ from the other six; nay, it is remarkable, that this its difference cou'd only be understood when applied to himself, since it was his own *working* and *resting* which made the difference: Nor cou'd the Creator's *working* and *resting*, be a *rule of conduct* to man, unless a positive and express precept was exhibited to make it so; for if it cou'd,
then

then God's never ceasing from his works of providence, but continuing those his workings hitherto, and equally on the seventh days, as on any other days, wou'd be a reason for our working on those days indiscriminately also; except it can be shewn that there is a greater propriety in our imitation of his working in the Creation, than of his working in his Providence. Thus, I think, it appears with considerable force, that the Creator's resting, was no reason of rest to Man, till it was thus applied in an express Precept.

Again, Blessing and Sanctifying, *Gen. ii.* may be refer'd to God himself, by the very same figure, that *ceasing to create*, is called *rest*: nay, the Scripture does thus actually refer it to him, *Exod. xxxi. 16, 17.* he *rested* and was refreshed, *i. e.* as Bp. Patrick says, was delighted in the contemplation of all his works, which he saw were very good: and he observes from *Maimonides*, that the word *jinna-phash*, which we translate, *was refreshed*, comes from *Nepheesh*, which among other things signifies, *the intention of the mind, or the will*; and that therefore the sense of this phrase is, *all the will of God was perfected, and brought to a conclusion*: his whole good pleasure was absolutely finished on the seventh day. But if, on the other hand, we shou'd refer *blessing* and *sanctifying*, as here mention'd, to the *seventh day*, it can have no apparent or intelligible meaning, except we understand it as intending the separation of that day from the other six, by the different conduct of the Creator thereon; and thus ultimately refering it to God himself.

Once more, it does not appear from the manner of Expression, that by blessing and sanctifying the *day* on which he rested, that he did by doing so, set it apart in all its future revolutions for the *rest* and refreshment of his Creatures: for the Text does
not

not say, THAT ON THAT DAY ON WHICH HE RESTED, HE BLESSED THE SEVENTH DAY ; no ; but that he blessed *it*, even that individual *it*, because that on *it* he rested. Nor do I think it had any further reference till it had a place given it in the *Jewish* precept.

Farther, that very seventh day on which the Creator rested, cou'd not be a Sabbath to *Adam* ; for according to the express letter of the *Jewish* precept, (which you must own to be the most explicit law of the Sabbath ;) it is said, *Six days shalt thou labour and do all that thou hast to do, but the seventh day is the Sabbath——for in six days the Lord made heaven, &c. i. e. six days the Creator worked and finish'd his design, and rested the seventh day.* Now, here, according to the order of the precept, six days *labour* is to precede that of *rest* : but the day on which the Creator rested, was the very day after *Adam* was created ; and therefore it cou'd not be *Adam's* Sabbath, either from the order of the precept, or from an imitation of the Creator: for even here the reason of the law, or, of what you call the *original Institution*, wou'd fail you; and *Adam's* resting on his second day, cou'd not be an exact copying after his Creator, who rested not till he had gone thro' his six days design, or work. I hope, Sir, you'll allow this reasoning to be conclusive, since you defend *adult Baptism* from the order of the words in the original Commission.—

You might perhaps say, That upon my Scheme, every *Jew* that was born on a different day, must have a different Sabbath? But this, I think, will not follow, because they were not *working creatures* as soon as they were born ; as *Adam* seems to have been, as soon as he was created.

Again, notwithstanding the brevity of the history, it is most reasonable to expect, that if the observance
C of

of a distinct day, even that very seventh day on which the Creator rested, in its exact revolutions, was of so great importance as you contend for, that if so, some mention wou'd have been made of it, and not a profound silence about it. How rational is the conjecture, that had it been in such observance, that some express hint wou'd have been given in the particular history of *Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, or Joseph*; at least, that some intimation wou'd have been discover'd of the *Hebrews* keeping it in *Goshen, or Egypt*: and if not this, yet at least, of their being prevented from, or molested in their observance of it, by their Task-masters; who were so very severe upon them, that they assign'd them their tasks *καὶ ἡμερῶν*, as the Septuagint, *day by day: pensum quotidianum*, or their *daily task*, as the Samaritan translation renders it: *per singulos dies*, or *every several day*, as the *Targum Onkelos*; and as the *Hebrew*, *opus diei*, in *die suâ*, *the work of every day in its proper day* *: all which concur in an intimation that their labour was enjoin'd with great strictness and severity, and without any intervals of rest. So that it is more than probable, that if the seventh-day Sabbath had been in use, it must have occasion'd some notable struggle and contention about it; except you'll suppose that the *Egyptians* kept the same day also, or that the *Israelites* had a great indifference about it.

Let it be consider'd, that the method in which God conversed with men thro' the patriarchal ages, seems to have been somewhat different from what it was afterwards; we have mention made of visible appearances, and ministrations of Angels, by frequent visits they made to the heads of Families, upon extraordinary occasions; whereas in after-ages the wisdom of God thought fit to instruct men

* The patriarchal Sabbath, p. 140.

by other methods; as the *Jews* had a *Tabernacle* appointed, and after that a *Temple*, to which the symbols of the divine presence were more especially confin'd: Thus God, at sundry times, and in diverse manners, did make known his will to mankind.

Your conjecture, that the *piety* of some of the patriarchs * must have obliged them to have separated a weekly day for publick worship;—don't appear to me to have much force; because, if we suppose they did not, their *piety* can by no means be call'd in question, except we can prove that they were subjects of such a law. Nor cou'd they be said to have acted contrary to the reason and fitness of things, by such neglect, unless we can prove that such relations and fitnesses did exist, which demanded such an observance: but surely you'll not pretend to say, that from the nature of things men cou'd have discerned, that one day in *seven* was more proper for a *rest*, than one day in *six*, or one in *eight*; much less, that such an individual seventh day, in its revolutions, cou'd appear from the nature of things more fit than another. And, as I can find no such intimation given, either in the historical narrative, *Gen. ii.* or in any subsequent part of the Mosaic history, till the giving of manna; nor, any ground to believe that *Adam* did actually know any thing about the Creator's *rest*, any more than he knew any thing about his manner of *working* the other six days; I from hence conclude your conjecture about the patriarchs keeping the seventh-day Sabbath has no foundation. On the other hand, if we attend to the light of nature, unassisted with revelation, we shall find no room to distinguish any one day as more holy than another; but shall conclude, if we act reasonably, we ought every day to pay our

* p. 10, 11. of your farther vindication.

most grateful acknowledgments to the great Fountain of Being, whose offspring we are! and that on all signal and extraordinary events of his providence towards us, we, in a more especial manner, make our addresses to him: and I doubt not but that this was the case with the Patriarchal Ages.

I know there are some who wou'd have it, that even those nations who had no manner of intercourse with the *Jews*, paid a particular regard to the seventh day; which tradition they imagine cou'd not have become so universal, except it had been handed down from our first Parents*.

But I imagine this inconclusive also, for the following reasons.

There might, 'tis true, be mention made of a distinguish'd seventh day among distant nations; but how we shall know that such traditions were not collected from the *Jews*, I am not able to determine: besides, if this was the case, it will be as difficult to shew, how the separation of one day in seven, recommended to the *Jews*, call'd the seventh day, cou'd be a badge of distinction between them and the rest of the nations?

S E C T. II.

I Shall now consider more minutely than in my former Tract, whether the Law of the Sabbath can, upon due examination, be understood as a *moral precept*. What I have offer'd as reasons for its not being so, you are pleas'd to call only *pretended proofs*, p. 7.

That I may be the better understood, I shall give my own sense of *Morality*: which I define thus,

* Patriarchal Sabbath, p. 64, 65. *Hesiod*, *Homer*, and *Linus* gave encomiums on the seventh day.

thus, *Morality* is the conformity of principles, or actions to truth: By a *precept* being call'd a *moral precept*, I understand such a precept, the reason of which is founded in the nature, relations, or fitness of things prior to, and independent on a consideration of the will and pleasure of any being whatsoever: a *positive precept* is what must depend on the consideration of the will of another for its obligation, since its force cannot be discover'd to arise from the reason and nature of things abstracted from the will of another. Thus for instance, every of those precepts which direct to, and plainly express, those obligations which evidently arise from our relation to God, and other *beings*, are properly *moral precepts*: and these are distinguishable from all such as may be calculated to promote our virtue; but yet, at the same time, are not to be discerned in their force or obligation, except we take in the will of another. To this, the very subject of debate will afford a farther illustration, since it is not about a seventh, or any part of time being set apart, or devoted to pious or religious observance; but it is whether such a particular seventh part corresponding as exactly with that very period of time on which the Creator rested from Creation, as any ectype can agree with its original; and the question put, is, whether this be binding upon us, or no? Now, if the precept or law of the Sabbath thus considered, be in its own nature *moral*, it might be known in its force or obligation exclusive of the will of any Being, and wou'd be of eternal obligation; so that whilst we remain, not only working creatures, but even whilst we continue moral agents, the obligation must remain inviolable.

You indeed seem to take it for granted, that the law of the Sabbath is truly of a *moral nature*, in several passages of your Tract; and I understand
you

you as intending thus much, by your grand principle or axiom laid down, p. 16. where you say, "*that the reason of every law is a law.*" Let me then apply this axiom in the case before us, and then you may be understood as saying, that altho' there was no express injunction of a Law-giver, invested with proper authority to enjoin, nor any explicit or formal promulgation of such a thing as his will, yet the reason of the law of the *seventh-day Sabbath* being prior even to the patriarchal age, it will follow that it was a law to that age; altho' the express injunction of the Law-giver, and the explicit promulgation thereof, was not of at least 2400 years after the reason thereof first existed. And this, *Sir*, must continue to be a true state of your argument, till you have prov'd that God's resting at the Creation was actually and expressly promulgated as a law before the coming of the *Israelites* out of *Egypt*: ——— But I apprehend that this your *reason of a law*, cou'd not be a law, because it has no appearance of the form of a law; and cou'd not be understood in any such light, by unassisted reason; nor is there any intimation of its being explain'd as such, either to *Adam*, or to any of his descendants thro' the patriarchal ages.

But farther, there does not appear to be any thing more intended by the institution of rest from all manner of labour, or sabbatizing, but these two things; one of which I have already remark'd, *viz.* That it, being urg'd as a conformity to the Creator's rest, the *Jews* observance of it shou'd point out the relation they stood in to the Creator; and secondly, It was to keep alive a remembrance of that extraordinary slavery and bondage they had endur'd in *Egypt*. To fix this remembrance more strongly upon their minds, there was to be an universal relaxation from servile labour and bondage among

among them ; every seventh day, not only *they*, but their *slaves*, and *cattel* were exempted from labour, nay, every seventh year was to be a year of release, not only from labour, but from *confinement*, *Exod.* xxi. 2. *Deut.* xv. 1, 2, 3. as a consequence of which relaxation the *land* was to rest, or become uncultivated ; and lest those more frequent returns of rest, shou'd not sufficiently impress them, they were enjoin'd a grand jubilee, or Sabbath of weeks of years, *viz.* every fiftieth year : all which considerations intimate strongly to me, that the *Sabbatic-institution* was peculiarly suited to the state and circumstances of the *Jews* ; and so cou'd not be of a moral nature. Nor cou'd the reason of their resting, from the consideration of the Creator's resting, be any other than a positive reason of rest : no fitness of such rest arising from any antecedent consideration ; but solely from its aptness to connect their ideas of the *Creator*, and their *Deliverer*, being one and the same Being, as I have already observed.

You say indeed, *p.* 6. " That if the fourth Commandment be not moral, because the Sabbaths were given for a *sign* of a peculiar relation between God and the *Jews* ; then on the same *ratio*, neither will any of the other nine be moral, because the whole that was commanded the *Jews* by God, when he brought them out of *Egypt*, was sometimes called by those names. *Deut.* vi. 8. xi. 18. *Jerem.* xi. 3, 4."

Thus, *Sir*, you confound a standing *Sign* of the peculiar relation which God bore to the *Jews*, with the Covenant he made with them : and would make me say what I never said, *viz.* That every branch of the *Jewish* Covenant must needs be peculiar to the *Jews*.

But more particularly, in *Deut.* vi. 8. xi. 18. God commands the *Israelites* to write down his Co-

Covenants, and to wear them on the palms of their hands, and between their eyes ; and this he makes a *sign* of his peculiar relation to them. Pray, Sir, was not this a custom peculiar to the *Jews* ?

That the *Sabbath* was given to the *Jews* for a *Sign*, is evident to a demonstration, if you'll admit scripture authority.

Exod. xxxi. 12, 13, 14, 16, 17. And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, speak thou also unto the Children of Israel, saying, Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep, for it is a SIGN between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you ; ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore, for it is holy unto you,——it is a Sign between me and the children of Israel for ever ; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed. As this Text is so express, I shall remark a few things from it. And hence it appears,

1. That by *Sabbaths* is meant the *seventh-day Jewish Sabbath* ; the 13th and following verses compar'd.

2. It is strongly affirm'd to be a *Sign* to the *Jews*, and confin'd only to them ; from these words, *a Sign between me and you, throughout your generations, wherefore the Children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe that Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual Covenant ; it is a Sign between me and the children of Israel for ever.*

3. I wou'd remark, that *throughout their generations*, gives the true sense of *perpetual Covenant* ; and *for ever* ; and that therefore this Covenant was but to last thro' the *Jewish* state.

4. That the thing signified by this *Sign*, was, God's separation of the *Jews* from the rest of the nations.—*It is a Sign between me and you ; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you,*

you; or separate you: ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore, for it is holy unto you. comp. Lev. xx. 24. Deut. iv. 20.

5. If the word *Sabbaths* is rightly translated, (which I am persuaded it is,) it will hence follow, that *Sabbaths* in *Col. ii. 16.* may be justly interpreted of the *Jewish Sabbath*, and as such, might with the utmost propriety be put among the *Shadows* of things to come.

Lastly, That as God was refreshed or delighted upon the seventh day, having finished his work; so they might be refreshed or delighted with the view of their alter'd circumstances, occasion'd by a wonderful deliverance from *Egyptian Slavery*.

To proceed; The *Sabbath* appears to have been wholly directed by the deliverance of the *Israelites* out of *Egypt*, and marked out to them by the giving of *Manna*; *Exod. xii. and xvi. chap.* compared: see also *p. 13, 14.* of my Tract. From the history *Moses* gives of it, we learn, that that very deliverance did actually invert *Creation order*, as it altered their months and years. The year, according to *Creation*, begun in the *autumnal Equinox*, *i. e.* about our *September*; according to *Lightfoot*, and other critical Writers; but from this *Epocha* of their deliverance, the year was to begin in the *vernal Equinox*, *i. e.* about our *March*: *Exod. xii. 2. This month shall be unto you the beginning of months, it shall be the first month of the year unto you.* Now can any man from hence imagine, that the *Israelites* had been subject to the law of the seventh-day Sabbath, and no intimation given about it, at such an important alteration of their years and months? But if their Sabbath, (upon a supposition that they had had one in observance,) did not suffer a change by this alteration of the years and months; yet this we are sure of, *viz.* That *Creation order*, (on which

D

you

you seem to support your Scheme in some measure,) was here inverted to give way to an event, viz. the deliverance of the *Israelites* out of *Egypt*; and a new institution and chronology took place in order to commemorate that event, throughout the generations of such who were concerned therein.

The institution of the Sabbath appears very fit and proper, as it demanded a weekly relaxation from labour, both for man and beast; and as such, excited in them the most grateful acknowledgments of their alter'd circumstances; who, when in *Egypt*, knew no such Intervals, but were engaged in *incessant Servitude*.

You say, p. 42. "That you imagine, with me, that there cou'd be nothing in the *reason* and *nature* of things, that cou'd make the seventh day of any week more holy, *properly speaking*, than the rest: yet you add, But there may be, and certainly was, (as you say you have already prov'd,) something in the reason or nature of things, which rendred the *seventh day* of the week more proper for a *Sabbath*, than any of the other days: not but that the *Sabbath* was originally of positive appointment; but then that appointment was plainly founded on reasons resulting from the nature of things, which reasons still subsist, and ever will subsist, so long as the present world stands, and man remains a working Creature; the seventh day therefore originally created a Sabbath, ought so long to remain a Sabbath to all those who are acquainted with the history of the Creation, and of the origin and institution of the Sabbath, whether the fourth Commandment be abrogated or no."

This being one of the most remarkable passages in your defence, I shall bestow upon it a particular consideration.

You

You say, That you imagine with me, that there cou'd be nothing in the reason and nature of things, that cou'd make the *seventh day* of any week more holy, *properly speaking*, than the rest: *your next words are*, But there may be, and certainly was something in the reason or nature of things, which rendred the *seventh day* of the week *more proper* for a *Sabbath*, than any of the other days. How you solve this paradox, I know not; but that it is false reasoning will undeniably appear, if the terms are understood in their common acceptation: And by *holy*, *properly speaking*, we are to understand any thing separated, or set apart for a religious use, and so it is with propriety applied to a *day*; but you imagine with me, that there cou'd be nothing in the reason or nature of things, that cou'd make the *seventh day* of any week more holy, *properly speaking*, than the rest; or cou'd be a reason for its being thus separated, or set apart for a religious use: but you farther say, That there was something in the reason and nature of things, which did render the *seventh day* of the week more properly a *Sabbath* than any of the other days. Now, I cannot see what idea you can possibly have of a *Sabbath*, (in the sense you so earnestly contend for it,) abstracted from its being *more holy*, than another day; or from its being *set apart* from the other days: for it is plain, from what you have offer'd in this controversy, that this is the most important view or idea you have, or, do form of a *Sabbath*: And if so, I chuse to leave you to draw the consequence.—

You go on, and say, Not but that the *Sabbath* was originally of *positive appointment*; but then that appointment was plainly founded on reasons resulting from the nature of things. This, I confess, appears to me too sophistical; *viz.* That the *Sabbath* was a positive institution or appointment, and

yet that it was an appointment plainly founded on reasons resulting from the nature of things, *i. e.* according to your express words, there cou'd be nothing in the reason or nature of things that cou'd constitute the *seventh day* more holy than the rest ; but yet that appointment, *viz.* that positive appointment, the law of the seventh-day sabbath, was plainly founded on reasons resulting from the nature of things ; at the same time there was not any thing, either in the reason or nature of things, for any such thing to result from ! On the whole, I am assur'd you have here expressly given up the morality of the Sabbath ; and I hope that for the future you'll not condemn me for asserting, that it is not an institution of a moral nature.

But perhaps you'll say, That you have made a distinction between the *reason* and *nature of things* ; and reasons *plainly resulting* from the nature of things : supposing this, I shou'd be so far from understanding any such distinction, that the more I consider'd it, the more I shou'd be tempted to think it an affront to common sense ; for if any thing does plainly arise as a truth from the reason and nature of things ; or is founded on reasons plainly resulting from the nature of things ; whatever opinion I might have of it before, as dependent on *tradition*, the *opinion*, *will*, or *law* of another, and as such esteem'd it a positive rule or appointment ; yet when I can discern it to be plainly founded on reasons resulting from the nature of things, I no longer view it in any positive or dependent light, but esteem it the real offspring of the nature of things, from whence it so plainly results. — You say, the Sabbath was originally of positive appointment ; but then that appointment was plainly founded on reasons resulting from the nature of things ; by which you wou'd intimate a difference between positive and moral obligations ;
and

and yet at the same time you preserve no distinction; but make that which was originally a positive appointment, to be plainly a moral one.

Give me leave to try how your distinction will appear in this one plain instance of the *Passover*; this you know was originally a positive appointment, or institution, as well as the Sabbath, and was calculated to keep alive the memory of that remarkable event, viz. the destroying Angel's passing over the houses of the *Israelites*. Now, did their eating of unleavened bread for seven days, and on the seventh keeping a feast to the Lord annually, at which a Lamb was to be slain, *Exod. 13. beg.* did I say, their eating of unleavened bread, or their slaying of the Lamb, appear to be duties founded on reasons resulting from the nature of things? Surely no; the will of the *Lawgiver* was ever necessary to constitute the obligation to such observance; whereas had the institution appeared to have been plainly founded on reasons resulting from the nature of things, it must have obliged without, or independent on the will of another. And thus stands the case, with regard to the Sabbath; it being originally a positive institution, cou'd not be founded on reasons plainly resulting from the nature of things, for the reason of its being a positive institution.

'Tis a truth, I own, that there were certain circumstances attending particular events, which introduced a great propriety and fitness in these and other positive appointments; such were these that follow: When the *Israelites* had been ordered to sprinkle their door-posts with the blood of a lamb, as a token upon their houses, by which they should be secured from the destroying Angel; there was a consequent fitness in the appointment of a *Lamb* to be slain and eat at their memorial feast, called the passover; so likewise as to the Sabbath, there was

a great fitness in its being appointed as a *rest from labour*, when it was to be a memorial of their deliverance from that slavery and bondage which they had suffered in *Egypt*. And in this view stands the Christian Eucharist; it was the will of *Jesus* to eat bread, and drink wine, and give it to his disciples at the *last meal* he had with them before his Crucifixion; and to tell them, it was his pleasure that such eating and drinking among his disciples should be observed as a solemn memorial of his death. Now, in all these positive appointments, there was an apparent fitness and propriety; but this propriety was not founded on reasons plainly resulting from the nature of things, but on reasons plainly resulting from *particular* and *special* events.

Again, The non-morality of the *Sabbath* appears from the declaration of *JESUS CHRIST*, who said, *That the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath*: but man is a moral agent, and as such, a subject of the kingdom of reason, truth, or morality, to which his obedience is indispensibly required; but he was not made for such a subjection to the *Sabbath*; consequently the law of the *Sabbath* is not of a moral nature.

You say indeed, *p. 20*. That I thus strangely reason, if it may be called reasoning, that upon our Saviour's saying expressly of the *Sabbath*, that it was made for man, and not man for it; hereupon I ask, Can it then be an institution of a moral and indispensable obligation? No; I say, *HE, i. e. Jesus* says, *it was made for man, and must give way to his necessities*: On which you remark, "That it is not sufficient to prove any thing *not moral*, that it was made for man; *food* and *rest* were certainly made for man, and not man for them; but will it thence follow, that our making a proper use of the one, or the other, is not of moral obligation?"

"gation? our lordship over them, will not justify
 "either our not using them at all, or our using them
 "to excess."

I reply, Your proposition appears to be wrong, and therefore it is no wonder if we find the consequence you have drawn, not just. That the proposition is false in itself, appears thus; *food and rest*, you say, were certainly made for man, and not man for them: but on the contrary, I beg leave to say, that the appetite was made for *food*, as well as *food* for the appetite; and the Apostle tells me, that *meats are for the belly, and the belly for meats*; and you very well know, that the mechanism of the body is so form'd, that a relaxation of its muscles, nerves, and fibres is absolutely necessary from its very make; thus it was made for *rest*, as well as *rest* for it.

As a defence of what I have offer'd in my tract, on that passage of our Saviour's; let it be farther observ'd, that *Jesus* evidently there treats the *Sabbath* as a positive institution, and no more; otherwise his illustration will appear very unfit, and his argument plainly inconclusive: He asks the *Pharisees* if they had never read what *David* did when he had need, and was an hungred, he, and they that were with him, *Mark* ii. 25, 26, 27. *how he went into the house of God, in the days of Abiathar the Priest, and did eat the shew-bread, which is not lawful to eat, but for the Priests, and gave also to them which were with him*; and he said unto them, *the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath*. Now, I wou'd ask any unprejudic'd reader, whether the lawfulness of eating, or of not eating the *shew-bread*, did arise from the nature and reason of things, or from reasons resulting from the nature of things? or whether it was so from a merely positive appointment? And if from the latter, how incongruous it wou'd have been in our Saviour,

viour, from hence to conclude that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath, if the Sabbath was of a quite different nature; *viz.* a moral institution.

I farther remark, That this illustration of our Saviour's, drawn from *David* and his attendants eating the shew-bread, is designedly levell'd at the *Pharisees*, who were offended at his disciples plucking ears of corn in the fields on the Sabbath: *q. d.* 'Is it not a crime of a less nature, even according to your law, for men to pluck ears of corn in an open field, on the Sabbath, than for *lay-men* to eat the Priests consecrated bread *? If hunger excused in the more important case, it sure must in the less important one; therefore take this caution, *viz.* That before you condemn *me* for suffering my disciples to satisfy their hunger on your Sabbath, see that you censure and condemn *David* for demanding the holy bread, and eating it; not taken out of a common field, as my disciples have done by a few ears of corn, which is tolerated by your law †; but the holy bread out of the house of God, *even* bread taken from before the Lord ‖. Consider well what you are about, the circumstance of my disciples eating on a Sabbath, will make no material alteration, notwithstanding your great zeal about its holiness; for I tell you, *it was made for man*, and not man for the Sabbath: henceforward don't censure me any more than you wou'd *David*, for I, the *Son of Man*, *David's* Lord, am Lord also of the Sabbath.' With this reading, compare *Math.* xiii. 3, 4, 5, 6.

In

* *Lev.* xxiv. 9. The shew-bread was for *Aaron* and his Sons, who were to eat it in the holy place: *viz.* at the door of the tabernacle, *Exod.* xxix. 32. comp.

† *Deut.* xxiii. 25. ‖ *1 Sam.* xxi. 6.

In the 5th ver. there is this addition to the account given by St. Mark; *or have ye not read in the law, how that on the Sabbath-days the Priests in the Temple prophane the Sabbath, and are blameless? But I say unto you, that in this place is one greater than the Temple;* as if he had said, ‘As the service of the Temple, you all allow, render’d the Priests blameless even in their prophaning the law of the Sabbath; so all persons who are employed in my service, who are greater than the Temple, shou’d be much more excused, or looked upon as blameless.’ He adds, *But if ye had known what this means, I will have mercy and not sacrifice, ye wou’d not have condemn’d the guiltless; i. e.* ‘if you had learnt by your own Prophet *Hosea*, that natural or moral obligations must at any time take place of positive or ritual institutions, you wou’d not have condemn’d my disciples; for, the *Son of Man*, their Lord and Master, is Lord even of the Sabbath-day.’

You indeed have told me, p. 21. “That I might easily have observed, that *Son of Man* in the inference, must be the same as *man* in the proposition or premise; and that otherwise our Saviour’s reasoning wou’d have been inconclusive.”

But instead of this, you shou’d rather have shewn where our Saviour calls any other than himself by this title, *Son of Man*; or, at least, have shewn how this was an inference drawn from the proposition. The phrase, *Son of Man*, here mentioned, I of opinion, is the special distinguishing character our Saviour made use of to describe himself by, all thro’ his publick ministry; and therefore it was, that he never applied it to any description he has given, either of mankind in general, or of any other particular person.

I shall offer a conjecture, why our Saviour adopted this title, *Son of Man*; and he made use of it in all probability with this view, *viz.* That he might fix the attention of the *Jews* more fully upon him; since their Prophets very usually had told the people, that the *word of the Lord*, or the message they were to deliver to them from the Lord, was imparted or revealed to them under the character or title of *Son of Man*; for so their commission ran, *Son of Man go, and tell the people, &c.* hence I say, in all probability it was that this great Prophet *Jesus* took the same character or title. It is, you'll find, above thirty times used by him, and always of himself, according to St. *Matthew's* Gospel-history; above twenty times in *Luke's*; nay, St. *Stephen* calls the glorified *Jesus* by this character—*And I saw the Son of Man standing, &c. Acts vii. 55, 56.* Nor is it once mention'd in all the New Testament, to signify any other than *Jesus Christ*, except it be a quotation from the Old Testament, as the 2d *Hebrews* and 7th verse may be.

It wou'd do little service to the cause of the morality of the *Sabbath*, which you contend for, if you cou'd prove *Son of Man* to be a conclusion drawn from the premise, *viz. man*, [the *Sabbath* was made for man;] since, if *man* be Lord of the *Sabbath*, in a like sense as he is Lord of the creatures, for so you have put it, it is then plain that the *Sabbath* is in a state of subjection to him; and of consequence *man* cannot be in a state of subjection to it; but with greater impropriety, surely you cou'd not have offer'd any thing in defence of the moral obligation of the *Sabbath*, than *food and rest*: Man being under a physical necessity to make use of these in order to the support of his natural life; whereas nothing like this can be said of his observance, or non-observance of the *Sabbath*. Besides,
the

the use or abuse of *food* or *rest*, will neither prove the morality or non-morality of either *food* or *rest*; it may indeed shew the degree of influence which *reason* has on our conduct, or the want of its influence; and so discover our own virtue, or morality, or our want of it; but how this illustration will be of any service to you, I don't discern. By this time, I doubt not but you see, that your *consequence* and *premise* are not so evident as you imagin'd; and that the morality of the Sabbath does no way appear from these passages so long had under consideration; but that the contrary strongly appears, viz. that the Sabbath was an institution of a merely positive nature, and confin'd to the *Jewish* state.

S E C T. III.

I Shall prove the repeal or abrogation of the *Sabbath*, from the *Apostle Paul*, and other *topicks*; and answer some objections made to the repeal.

“ You say, *p. 27.* That I have in manifest contradiction to my title-page, and other passages in my *book*, said, that neither *Jesus Christ* nor his *Apostles* expressly abrogated the *Jewish Sabbath*; yet in *St. Paul's* opinion, about the obligation of the law of the *seventh day*, I unfortunately tell you, that in *Col. ii. 16, 17.* he is pretty express, for having in the 14th *verse* shewed that *Christ* had blotted out, or caused to be cancell'd the obligation of all those *Jewish rites* and *ceremonies*, which had distinguished them from the rest of mankind, he there says, *Let not man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath.* Your first remark upon it is this, “ So that tho' neither *Christ*

“nor his Apostles expressly abrogated the Jewish Sabbath, yet St. Paul, it seems, here expressly taught, or shewed, that Christ had blotted out, cancelled, or abrogated it; neither Christ nor his Apostles did expressly abrogate it; but the Apostle Paul was pretty express in shewing that Christ had abrogated it.”

I fancy the edge of this witticism will be somewhat blunted, by giving the reader my own words as they lie in p. 27. and 22. from whence you have collected them. In p. 27. I have said, “That on the foundation of such like reasons (as I had before offer’d,) I apprehended it was, that neither Jesus Christ, nor his Apostles, expressly abrogated the Jewish Sabbath: nevertheless, I have already shewn that our Saviour has expressly asserted the non-moral obligation of the Sabbath; and that his Apostle Paul has as expressly mark’d it out, as one of those distinguishing institutions which belonged to the Jewish constitution:” And in p. 22. I have said thus, “Let us in the next place see, what St. Paul’s opinion was about the obligation of the Law of the seventh day: and in his epistle to the Coloss. chap. ii. 16, 17. he is pretty express.” I should have thought that any man might have seen that pretty express here, had for its antecedent, in his opinion, about the obligation of the law of the seventh day; and on this account I might have been secure. — I add, “for having in the 14th verse shewed that Christ had blotted out, or cancelled the obligation of all those Jewish rites and ceremonies, which had distinguished them from the rest of mankind; he here says, Let no man judge you, i. e. you Christians, in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath; which were only temporary services or institu-
tions,

"tions, or which suited the Jewish economy; but
 "at the same time, were no more than the shadow is
 "to the substance, when compar'd with Christianity."

"Rom. xiv. 5, 6. St. Paul says, *One man esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth every day alike; let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind, he that regardeth a day, regardeth it to the Lord, and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he does not regard it.*" From which passages, by the way, I think we may safely infer, that the law of the Sabbath was not then in force; nor had the obligation of an unrepealed precept; for if it had, we must charge St. Paul with being very lax in his writing, and very unguarded in his advice.—Conformable to the sentiment he has here advanced about the holiness of days, he says, *Gal. iv. 10, 11. Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years; I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain.* Now, pray Sir, is not St. Paul pretty express in asserting the Christian's liberty from such obligations that any of the laws of the Jews had laid them under, with respect to distinction of days? *One man esteems one day above another, another man esteems every day alike; let every man be persuaded in his own mind. q. d.* "The true state of the case is this, with you Christians, all distinction of days as to the holiness of them, is ceased, altho' before you embrac'd Christianity, you were obliged as Jews to such observances; but he among you that regards a day now, regards it to the Lord." Is it not natural to ask here, what Lord that was to whom Christians were to keep or consecrate their days? one wou'd think it cou'd be no other than that Jesus who had declared himself *Lord of the Sabbath.*

Thus I think I have shewn that St. Paul was pretty express about the non-obligation of the law of the Sabbath, or any other Jewish holy-day, altho'

at

at the same time, neither our Saviour nor his Apostles were so express, as by a distinct prohibition to point out singly the repeal of the Sabbath; nevertheless I imagine that any one may see, that it is manifestly included among the obsolete, repeal'd, and enervated *rudiments* of that constitution.

You seem a little severe, p. 28. because I had rendred the word *σαββατων* of the Sabbath, when it shou'd have been *Sabbaths*, Col. ii. 16, 17.

Now, you say, Had I honestly translated the word, and fairly observ'd that the *Sabbaths* here mention'd, were a shadow of things to come, I had acted in character; — whereas, by making so uncommon a blunder as that, even contrary to our common version, I by doing so, have unhappily reduc'd every intelligent reader to the unavoidable necessity of calling in question my attention, capacity, or candour."

In reply, I freely own that *σαββατων* is plural, and shou'd have been render'd *Sabbaths*, but since I am conscious to myself of no design in making so uncommon a blunder of leaving out an (*s*), and so putting singular for plural, I do patiently bear the charge.

But give me leave to ask you, whether I took any advantage by such rendring? or whether any cou'd accrue to my argument by this mistake? If not, how is every intelligent reader under the unavoidable necessity you speak of? To proceed,

You say in your note, p. 28. That your reading clears at once the passage from all tautology; which is this, *Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy-day; whether new moon, or Sabbaths, which are a shadow of things to come.*

I wou'd observe, that to me there appears no tautology in the text, as our translators have render'd it; and I think your reading is not just: my reason

is

is as follows, There can be no tautology made to appear in the text, except it can be prov'd that the *Jews* had no other days which they esteemed as *holy-days*, but their *new moons* and *Sabbaths*. But Dr. *Whitby* has observed, that *Sabbaths*, *new moons*, and *other festivals*, are often mentioned as distinct from each other.—*

Besides, the *Greek* word, which you have translated [*whether*] is four times used in that *verse*, and rendred [*or* !] Now, why it may not equally be rendred [*whether*] the three other times, I see not ; since it wou'd not make the sense more imperfect, than it does by this your rendring, but rather the less perplex'd ; especially as it is well known that the *Jews* had other *holy-days* besides their *new moons* and *Sabbaths*.

But supposing you have mended the text, what advantage will your argument have in defence of the Sabbath, by such rendring ? Surely none at all : for if the *seventh-day Sabbath* was one of their *Sabbaths*, this Sabbath as well as the rest, being only a temporary institution and *sign*, must have took its lot with the others ; for we are assured, that it is no where secur'd by a *saving clause*, and therefore it must, in the account of *St. Paul*, be *only a shadow of things to come*.

You say p. 28, ' That the *seventh-day Sabbath* was originally instituted for a grateful commemoration of a past event ; and hence you ' wou'd not have it thought to be a *shadow of things to come* : And in p. 29. you say, You have prov'd ' from,

* Their *Feast of Trumpets*, which was kept on the first day of the month *Tisri*, and was their *first month*, according to *civil computation*, but their *seventh* according to their *sacred*, *Lev. xxiii. 24.* was a day on which they were neither to buy nor sell ; and on which they had special sacrifices ; and was neither *New moon* nor *Sabbath*, *2 Kings iv. 23.* See, *Godwin's Aaron and Moses, lib. iii. p. 148.*

‘ from principles of revelation, that the seventh-day Sabbath was first instituted to commemorate an event then past.’

But you’ll please to consider that the Sabbath’s being a *shadow of things to come*, is no way inconsistent with its being a commemoration of a past event; of this the *passover* is a plain instance, for the Apostle says expressly that Christ *our passover* is sacrificed for us: and yet you know that the passover was instituted in commemoration of a past event. We see then that notwithstanding the Sabbath was a commemoration of a past event, yet this cou’d be no bar in the view of St. Paul from determining it a *shadow* of things to come.

Your remark, p. 35. in which you wou’d palm a contradiction upon me, with respect to the *Jewish* converts making a *stir*, and not making a *stir* about their Sabbath, may have this solution. I say, p. 28. of my tract, “ That because the first Christians continued the observance of the Sabbath whilst the *Jewish* Polity lasted; such complaisance left no room for any *such stir* among the *Jews* about their Sabbath, (as they had made about circumcision:) “ but yet I think that it is highly probable that some “ of the *Jewish* converts might make a *stir* about “ their Sabbath.” I yet think they might, tho’ not *such a stir*; and we find it very probable that they did, since the Apostle reproves them at *Rome*, *Rom. xiv. beg.* for censuring one another about the difference of days: and the *Galatians*, chap. iv. 10, 11. about their observance of days: and he seems to intimate that the *Judaizing Teacher* had infected them with a notion of the necessity of such peculiarities of the *Jewish* constitution being ingrafted into the Christian scheme.

In p. 34, 35. you say, whereas I imagine that Christians will scarcely conclude from St. Paul’s circumcising

cumcising *Timothy*, that therefore circumcision is a *rite* becoming the Christian covenant; "That you cannot but think it much more becoming a Christian hence to conclude that circumcision is a *rite* not inconsistent with Christianity, than the contrary; and that from this instance of *St. Paul's* conduct, comp. with *Gal. v. 2.* and other passages in his epistles, their conclusion, with respect to circumcision, may perhaps not be the farthest from truth, who suppose that Christianity did not oblige the *Jewish* Christians to renounce circumcision, but expressly declared the Gentile Converts under no manner of obligation to receive it."

I continue of opinion, notwithstanding this, that Christians will scarcely conclude from *St. Paul's* cumcising *Timothy*, that therefore circumcision is a *rite* becoming the Christian Covenant; and am surpriz'd that you should assert this rather to be a conclusion more becoming a Christian; *viz.* That circumcision is a rite not inconsistent with Christianity; than the contrary. For we are told, *Acts xv. 1, 5.* that there were certain men from *Judea*, who laid a stress on circumcision; in reply to whom *St. Peter* observes, verse 10. that it was a *tempting* of God, and a putting an *intolerable yoke* on the neck of the disciples. Now *Peter*, I think, was a *Jew* originally, and the Apostle to the *Jews*, or the circumcision. *St. Paul* calls these very men who taught the doctrine of circumcision, *false brethren*, *Gal. ii. 4.* and chap. v. 2; 3. he expressly says, that *Christ, i. e.* the Christian Religion, should profit them nothing if they were circumcised; for I testify again to every man, (*Jew* as well as *Gentile*,) that is circumcised, *that he is a debtor to do the whole law.* Hence I apprehend, their supposition will appear far enough from truth, who imagine that *Christianity*

did not vacate or destroy the use of circumcision to the *Jewish* Converts, as well as to the *Gentile* ones. The original design of circumcision will prove this, as it was instituted to be a sign, or standing mark, or seal of a promise which God made to *Abraham*, that in him, i. e. in his seed, all nations of the earth should be blessed; *Gen.* xii. 3. comp. with *Gal.* iii. 8. And who this seed was, *St. Paul* expressly tells us, *Gal.* iii. 16. that it was *Christ*. Now this sign or mark was to distinguish the Posterity of *Abraham* from other Nations, inasmuch as the promis'd seed was to arise from his Family: but when the blessing promised was actually given, the sign or seal, viz. circumcision, must be useless; nay, the continuance of it wou'd be very inconsistent, since it wou'd intimate that the Covenant, or Promise, of which it was the seal, was yet in force, and unperformed. And that the promis'd seed was not actually come: and hence it is that the Apostle declares, *That there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither bond nor free, neither male nor female, for all are one in Christ; i. e.* the Christian institution had fully vacated all marks of distinction.

Circumcision therefore cou'd not be a rite becoming the Christian Covenant, nor suitable to the design of it; neither cou'd *St. Paul's* circumcising *Timothy* be defended on the grand plan of Christianity; but upon that useful maxim he pursued in that superstitious and prejudiced age, viz. his becoming all things to all men, that he might gain some; agreeably to this, we are told *Acts* xvi. 3. that *Paul* took and circumcised him, because of the *Jews* that were in those quarters.

But if we shou'd take your account of this action of *St. Paul's* in the light you have put it, you allow, that the Apostle's observance of a *Jewish* ordinance

nance intimates, that Christianity did not oblige the *Jewish* Christians to renounce that ordinance, but left them at their liberty concerning it; whereas, it by no means appears from hence that the Gentile Christians were under any manner of obligation to receive it. From whence this is a natural inference, *viz.* that the Apostle's keeping the *Sabbath*, cou'd it be prov'd, wou'd only shew us that the *Jews* were not obliged to renounce the *Sabbath*, but were at liberty about it; whereas the Gentile Converts wou'd hereupon be under no manner of obligation to keep it.

You again remark, *p.* 40. and say, " That you think it wou'd puzzle the most penetrating genius to assign a reason for what I have offer'd about the seventh-day *Sabbath* being *sign* between God and the *Jews*, of their being his peculiar people; but that under the Gospel, God is not known to us as the God of *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and *Jacob*, who brought the *Israelites* out of *Egypt*; but as the God and Father of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, in whom he is reconciling the world unto himself; and that therefore the *first day* (understood as the day of *Christ's* resurrection,) is more properly observed by Christians than the seventh."

That a less penetrating genius may not be overmuch puzzled, let it be observed, That when God commission'd *Moses* to lead the *Israelites* out of *Egypt*, he with great propriety told him, that he who gave him this Commission was the God of *Abraham*, of *Isaac*, and of *Jacob*, to whom great and remarkable promises had been made; and this was told *Moses*, to encourage his faith or trust in God *. And, when *Moses* was to deliver his message to the children of *Israel*, he was to tell them, that the Lord God of their fathers, the God of *Abraham*,

F 2

the

* *Exod.* iii. 6.

the God of *Isaac*, and the God of *Jacob*, had sent him to them; and that this was his name and memorial to all generations. Which must appear with great propriety, since the promise not only of *Canaan*, but of the *Messiah* also, was made to these their forefathers, as *blessings* in which they, or their descendants were to be more immediately concern'd.

Again, it was in pursuance of this promise made to them, that he expressly declares that he gave *Canaan* to the *Israelites* for a possession. *Deut. ix. 5. Not for thy righteousness, or for the uprightness of thy heart, dost thou go to possess this land: but for the wickedness of these nations the Lord thy God does drive them out from before thee; and that he may perform the word which the Lord swore unto thy fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*.*

And in the 27th verse, when *Moses* prays that the people may not be destroyed for their wickedness, he says, *remember thy servants, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.*—And we are told, *2 Kings xiii. 23. That the Lord was gracious to them, and had compassion on them, and had respect to them, because of his covenant made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and wou'd not destroy them.* Hence it appears highly fit, that God shou'd be known to the *Jewish* nation under this Character; and at the same time it is equally manifest, that he cou'd not with such propriety be known under this character, as the God of other nations. Now, if we remark lastly, that when the wall of partition was broken down, and *all things*, or *nations*, were collected together, or made *one in Christ, i. e.* by the Christian doctrine, it must be highly improper, under such a dispensation of things, to retain such a distinguishing character of Deity, as his being the Father of the fleshly seed of *Abraham*; since

* N. B. This Text gives a rational account of the destruction of the *Canaanites*, and of the succession of the *Israelites*.

since that wou'd imply that the Covenant of peculiarity was yet in force. As a farther consequence of this, it appears with great congruity, that God shou'd be known to Christians, as the God of him who is the *Father of the ages of Christianity*, upon whose shoulders the distribution and government of them is laid; and who has extended the empire of mercy and truth to all nations, without the least distinction or exception! So also the Apostle teaches us by his prayers and praises, (*Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, 2 Cor. i. 3. Eph. i. 3. Col. i. 3.) that this is the proper character by which he is known to Christians. I shall shew anon, that the resurrection of *Christ* was the most important event to Christians, and then prove that they with most propriety observed the day of his resurrection.

I proceed yet further, to shew that the *Sabbath* is repeal'd or abrogated, from the following considerations.

1. If the institution of the *Sabbath* be yet in force, because there was an express Command for the keeping it, then the *manner of keeping* must be in force also; because, the *manner of keeping* was as much the Subject of an express Command from God, as the *Sabbath* itself was: But the *law of keeping* is no more expressly abrogated by the Gospel, than the law of the *Sabbath*; therefore both must be yet of equal force and obligation. And it will follow hence, that if Christians wou'd keep the *Sabbath*, they ought to regulate their practice of *keeping it* by those express institutions; since you yourself say, p. 46. *That no event, whether ordinary or extraordinary, can vacate or destroy express institutions.* The *law of keeping*, we have Numb. xxviii. 9, 10.—*And on the Sabbath day two lambs of the first year, without spot, and two tenth deals of flour for a meat-offering mingled with oil, and the drink-offering there-*
of;

of; *this is the burnt-offering of EVERY SABBATH; besides the continual burnt-offering, and his drink-offering.* So also, if *any manner* of work was done thereon, it was to be punished with death; see *Exod. xxxi. 12, to 18.* And we find that a man was actually ston'd to death for gathering sticks on the Sabbath, *Numb. xv.* and that too, by an express command from the Lord, 35th verse.

Now these are express laws, which direct in the *manner of keeping* the Sabbath, which were never repeal'd by any express law; and therefore upon your own principles must be yet in force; because *no event* whatsoever, whether ordinary or extraordinary, can vacate or destroy an express institution. This then, *Sir*, appears to be the case, *viz.* That if the *Sabbath* be yet in force, the *laws of keeping* it must be in force also; yea, even those very *sanctions* which are affixed to the prophanation of it; since *one* is no more abrogated (in your sense of abrogation,) than the other is *by the Gospel*: hence I think I may safely infer, that no Christian in the world is a *Sabbath-keeper*.

You perhaps may object, That your not sacrificing the *two lambs* of the first year, without spot; and your not offering the meat-offerings and drink-offerings, in compliance with the law of the Sabbath, is, because *Christ* is represented as the Lamb of God, who has taken away the sins of the world, having been sacrificed for us; and that hence it appears that *sacrifices*, and the law of them, is abrogated. But pray, *Sir*, is this omission to be justified by an express law or institution, in the sense you contend for, about the abrogation of the Sabbath? According to you, *no event*, whether ordinary or extraordinary, can vacate the law of the Sabbath; but in our non-compliance therewith, we must have an *express institution* to regulate our practice by. Now, if those *particular services*,
which

which were expressly enjoined the *keeping of the Sabbath*, are vacated and abolished, without any express law or institution, the *Sabbath* may also be vacated or abrogated on the same reason. For,

2. If the *services* are vacated, and the *laws of keeping* expressly abrogated by the Gospel; and yet at the same time *that Gospel* has given no express directions about the manner of keeping of the Sabbath, in lieu of those vacated directions about keeping; it will hence follow, that the Sabbath is no longer in force, but plainly abrogated and repealed by that *new* constitution. But the premises are true, viz. that the law of *Sabbath keeping* is vacated, and that the Gospel has given no express directions about keeping the Sabbath; the consequence is undeniable, viz. that the Sabbath is vacated also; because in all such cases, we must have an express institution to regulate our practice by: but having no express institution to regulate our practice about *keeping* the Sabbath, we cannot *keep* the Sabbath.

You have a remarkable passage, p. 31. by way of objection to the repeal of the Sabbath; “ You
“ ask how it came that the Apostles, when in Gentile
“ Cities, wherein were but few *Jews*, did not take
“ the opportunity of undeceiving mankind, with
“ regard to the Sabbath requir’d by the Christian
“ institution? — And how came it, that the A-
“ postle of the Gentiles shou’d act so preposterously,
“ as by a piece of complaisance to a few *Jews*, be-
“ tray this very important truth? And how shall
“ we account for the Gentile inhabitants of *Antioch*
“ in *Pyfidia*, desiring of *Paul* and *Barnabas* on
“ the first *Sabbath* they were there, that the Gospel
“ might be preached to them again the next Sab-
“ bath, and not on the morrow? *Acts* xiii. 42.
“ The morrow being what I suppose to have been
“ the Christian Festival; why shou’d not this be
“ thought

“ thought a proper time to preach the word in; but
 “ the longing Gentiles must be defer’d a whole
 “ week, and the most favourable opportunity, the
 “ *first-day Sabbath* entirely neglected by the Apo-
 “ stles? A rational solution of these difficulties wou’d,
 “ you imagine, have been of no inconsiderable ser-
 “ vice to my cause.”

In reply, I think I have fully prov’d that the A-
 postle *Paul* did effectually enough betray this im-
 portant truth, from *Col. ii. 16, 17.* as also by his
 going into a Christian assembly on the first day of
 the week, and his *preaching*, and *breaking bread*
 thereon, *Acts xx.* nor is there one instance equal
 to these of his countenancing the Sabbath.

As to the Gentile inhabitants of *Antioch* desiring
 on the first Sabbath that *Paul* and *Barnabas* preach-
 ed to them, that they wou’d preach to them on the
 next; it is so far from being a strange thing, even
 upon my hypothesis, that it is most natural to sup-
 pose it: for consider, it was a *Jewish congrega-*
tion; the place of worship was a *synagogue*; and
 those Gentiles who besought *Paul* and *Barnabas*,
 were, in all probability, the *religious proselytes* which
 followed them, *Acts xiii. 42, 43.* Now these Gen-
 tiles no doubt looked on *St. Paul* as a *Jew*, who
 only differ’d from them with relation to the Messiah,
 and to whom he had said nothing about the repeal
 of the Sabbath. Hence you may see, that the cir-
 cumstances of the Church at *Antioch* render’d the in-
 troduction of the *first-day* Christian Festival, not
 the most favourable opportunity for public wor-
 ship; all the other days being working days with
 them, as well as with any part of *Judea*. Besides,
 the Apostle’s prudence appears in his taking no no-
 tice of the repeal of the Sabbath; this being his
 constant rule, as he expresses himself, *1 Cor. iii. 2.*
viz. to feed young converts to Christianity with
 milk

milk, and not to give them meat, or attack their strong prejudices till they were able to bear it; or better understood the Christian doctrine: and no doubt the repeal of the Sabbath was one of those doctrines which their great prejudices would not suffer them to digest so early. In this the Apostle prov'd himself a genuine disciple, by his following that excellent rule of his master's, *John* xvi. 12. *I have many things to say, but you cannot bear them now;* and *Mark*. iv. 33. — *he spake the word to them as they were able to bear it.*—This then, Sir, being a rational solution of your difficulties, I hope you'll think it to be of considerable service to my cause.

You say, *p.* 29. “ But if the *Jewish* œconomy “ was to continue till the destruction of *Jerusalem*, “ how comes our Saviour, either directly or in- “ directly, to teach his disciples to act contrary to “ it, before the approach of that remarkable event, “ by countenancing a transferring their religious re- “ gards from the seventh day of the week to the “ first? Is not teaching disobedience to a law in “ force, sin?”

The passages you have referr'd to in my Tract, are in *p.* 21. and *p.* 29. On which you have put these questions.

My words, *p.* 21. are these, “ It was not esteem- “ ed proper that the *Jewish* prejudices shou'd be “ strongly attack'd whilst their state continued; as “ they must have been by an explicate abrogation “ of their Sabbath.” And *p.* 29. “ Besides, this “ (*viz.* this epistle to the *Hebrews*;) was writ before “ the destruction of *Jerusalem*; and therefore the “ rest spoken of in the 4th Chapter, in the sense of “ the Sabbatists, cannot affect our present argu- “ ment.”

Now, how does this prove I have said, that the law of the Sabbath was to be in force among

Christians till the destruction of *Jerusalem*, or of the *Jewish* state? Altho' the dissolution of that Theocracy was to take place in that remarkable event; yet the *kingdom of truth* was actually established among Christians, previously to that event; and the subjects of this kingdom of *grace* and *truth*, were no longer oblig'd by that law given by *Moses*; but were absolved from such subjection, notwithstanding that *polity* was not totally destroyed till the destruction of their Temple and City: And all this while, such absolution from obedience, cou'd not be esteemed as *sinful* in the holy *Jesus*.

Nay, there is nothing more plain than that *Jesus* never kept the Sabbath; it is true he went into their Synagogues on the Sabbath, and taught the people from their own Scriptures, that the prophecies relating to the Messiah were accomplished; but so far was he from sabbatizing, that we find he frequently employ'd himself in acts of benevolence and mercy, going about doing good: On the other hand, because he did not sabbatize, he is frequently charged by the *Jews* as a prophaner of the Sabbath. I own it is true, that on these publick days he went into their Synagogues, but it was for this reason, *viz.* because the *times* and *places* afforded greater opportunities of his doing good; but then this will not prove that either those *places of worship*, or *times of worship*, received hereby a confirmation of their holiness, and the fitness of their continuance among Christians. Nor is our Saviour blameable for expressing such an indifference to their *Sabbath*, altho' their *polity* was not to be destroyed till the destruction of *Jerusalem*, any more than we are for omitting the whole affairs of their priesthood respecting sacrifices and offerings, because the *Jewish* infidelity remains in the world to this day.

Besides,

Besides, our Saviour cou'd not with so great propriety introduce the repeal of the Sabbath, (during the time of his public ministry,) in a more express manner than he did; the prejudices of the *Jews* running so high in favour of the holiness of it. Nor cou'd he be suppos'd to transfer the religious regards of his disciples to the *first day* of the Week, the great event of his Resurrection having not yet took place.

S E C T. IV.

I Shall prove, that the *first day* of the week was observed by the Church in the Apostles days; and endeavour a confutation of your pretence that the *seventh day* of the week was observ'd as a Sabbath by the primitive Christians, by proving that they kept the *first*.

I have shewn in my Tract, that there are instances to be found of Christians assembling together to worship God, by breaking of bread, and performing other acts of Christian worship on the *first day of the week*; as *Acts* xx. 7. which says, that *the disciples came together the first day of the week to break bread*——and also from *1 Cor.* xvi. 1, 2. *Now concerning the collection for the Saints, (or Christians,) as I have given order to the Churches of Galatia, even so do ye; on the first day of the week, let every one lay by him in store, as God hath prosper'd him, that there be no gatherings when I come.*

This sense of the text seems to be most natural, viz. That as the Apostle had given the Churches of *Galatia* orders to make their collections on the first day of the week, so he orders the *Corinthians* to make theirs on the same day; thus the *αὐτῶν ὑμῶν ποσιντοτε* is intelligible, *even so do ye, or,*

so make ye, *your collections on the first day of the week*: And thus the conformity of the practice of the *Corinthian Church*, appears to that of the *Galatian*; which conformity, I think, does not appear so plain, if this reading be not admitted.

Besides, as all you have advanced on these two texts, is insufficient to prove that these assemblies were held out of their ordinary course; till that is done, they will stand as sufficient proofs, that the Church had the *first day* of the week in religious observance, even in the days of the Apostles. This opinion is confirm'd by that text, *Rev. i. 10.* where *St. John* says, that he was in the Spirit of the Lord on the *Lord's day*. I know it is objected to this, that κυριακη ημερα, the *Lord's day*, is not to be found any where else in the New Testament; but yet it is very observable, that there is a particular *Christian rite* called by the same name; which very much confirms the application of this epithet to a known day, so distinguished among Christians; and that *rite* is the *Lord's Supper*; which is called κυριακον δειπνον, *1 Cor. xi. 20.* or that Supper which our Saviour instituted as a memorial of his death. Now, if we find a *day* expressly called by his name, in the same apostolic age; how natural is it for us hence to conclude, that this day was in observance of some remarkable event also? And if we add, the practice of the first Christians, it leaves little room for debate about what day that was.

I might indeed mention a reading which *Dr. Mill* and the *Oxford Greek Testament*, both have on that *1 Cor. xvi. 2. post, σαββατων την Κυριακην, i. e.* after, the first day of the week, *read, the Lord's day*; and then it wou'd run thus, — *on the first day of the week, the Lord's day, let every one, &c.* But I mention this as only one of the readings.

I proceed to observe, that the Fathers of the primitive ages of Christianity agree in this, *viz.* the keeping of the first day of the week, in honour and memory of our Lord's resurrection. This I have already shewn from LORD KING'S AUTHORITIES, p. 55, 56, 57. but wou'd yet more fully prove this point.

In p. 64. you do allow that *Barnabas* said, " We keep the eighth day with gladness, on which *Christ* rose from the dead." But then you say, " That a few lines before, the same *Barnabas* says, *If any man can now keep holy the day which God has sanctified, unless he be altogether pure in heart, we are mistaken* ; which two passages, when compared, you say, seem to intimate that he looked on the first day purely as a *festival* devoted to mirth ; but on the seventh, as a Sabbath devoted to acts of religion."

On the contrary, I think that these two passages, when compar'd, will intimate no such thing ; and that for the following reasons :

1. *Barnabas* in one passage expressly says, that the day on which *Christ* arose was kept ; but he does not in the other passage say, that the day which God had sanctified, and by which you suppose to be meant the Sabbath, was kept at all : he says, *If any man can now keep holy the day which God hath sanctified, unless he be altogether pure in heart, we are mistaken.* Now, had you refer'd us to any place where St. *Barnabas* has described such altogether pure persons who had such a day in keeping, it wou'd have been somewhat to the purpose : but this you have not done, neither cou'd you, for *Barnabas* had a notion that none cou'd so keep the Sabbath till the after-state.

2. In the former passage *Barnabas* is express, where he says, *we, i. e. we Christians keep with gladness the day of Christ's resurrection* : but in the other

other passage, he expresses his *doubt* in the strongest terms, *If any man can now keep-----we are mistaken.*

3. Christians keeping the eighth day with gladness, don't prove that they did not keep it as an holy Festival; on the contrary, this exactly agrees with the spirit of Christianity, and the genius of its worship. The first Christians eat their meat with gladness, and with singleness of heart: The Apostle *Paul* recommends a chearful spirit all thro' his *E-pistles*; he bids Christians rejoice evermore; *to rejoice in the Lord alway*: and again, he says, *rejoice.* This *intimation* then, of yours, shou'd have been supported by some sort of proof, that keeping the day of *Christ's* resurrection with gladness, was not a proper way of keeping the Christian festival.

Your next remark, *p. 64, 65.* is on the testimony of *Ignatius*; which testimony you wou'd invalidate by only shewing that *Ignatius* had a preceeding paragraph, about the prophets of *Christ* living according to *Christ*. You deny not, that *Ignatius* said, "Let us no longer sabbatize, but keep the Lord's day on which our Life arose;" and again, "After sabbatizing, or keeping the Sabbath, let every Christian keep the Lord's day, the day on which *Christ* rose again; the Queen of days, on which our Life arose, and death was conquer'd by *Christ.*" Since, I say, you allow this, and this so plainly agrees with the New Testament, surely any *more mystical* passage of *Ignatius's* writings, will not be able to overthrow such plain and strong relations of facts, as the above expressions contain.

You again confess, "That the Christians might meet on a *Sunday*, account it as one of their chief days, and not *fast* on it, any more than on the Sabbath; and yet only observe it as a festival, and not neglect the observation of the Sabbath." And you ob-

observe, from *Anathasius* and *Socrates*, ' that the
' Sabbath was kept in the fourth Century, and the
' holy mysteries celebrated thereon.'

I answer, That *Athanasius* was not for the obser-
vation of the seventh day as a Sabbath; for he says
in his *De Sabbato & Circumcis.* " When God had
" finished the first Creation, he did betake himself
" to rest; and therefore those of that Creation did
" keep the seventh day as a Sabbath: but the ac-
" complishment of the second Creation hath no end,
" and therefore God still worketh, as the Gospel
" teacheth. Hence it is that we keep no Sabbath
" as the antients did, but we expect an eternal Sab-
" bath, in which we being created anew, shall have
" no end."

Athanas. *Hom. de semente.* When we Christians
assemble on the Sabbath day, we do it not because
we are infected with *Judaism*, but to honour the
Lord *Jesus*, who is Lord of the Sabbath. In the
old time of the *Jews*, the *Sabbath* was highly es-
teemed; but now under the Gospel, the Lord hath
transferr'd that esteem on the Lord's day; for the
old Sabbath appertained to the Pædagogy and Rudi-
ments of the Law: and therefore, since the Master
is come, the Pædagogues hath been removed; and
since the sun hath risen, the Candle hath been put out.

Justin Martyr says, §. 87. And on that day
which is called *Sunday*, we have a common assembly
of all that live in the cities, or in the country;
wherein we read the records of the Apostles, &c.

Mr. *Whiston's* note is, that *Justin's* account is here
plain, that ordinarily no other day but *Sunday* was
allotted for the most solemn and general assemblies
of *Christians*, when the *Eucharist* was administred:
and that it was so done every *Sunday*, and the
communion received by all the faithful then present.

§. 89. Accordingly we all in general hold our assemblies on *Sunday*; since it is that first day [of the week] whereon God changed the darkness and the matter, and made the world: and the very same day did our Saviour *Jesus Christ* rise again from the dead. For they crucified him the day before *Saturday*; and on the day after *Saturday*, which is *Sunday*, when he had appeared to his *Apostles and disciples*, he taught them these things.—

Mr. *Whiston's* observation. xvth. The time when the Eucharist was to be celebrated was on the *Lord's day*, every *Lord's day* without fail; as the principal part of Christian worship on that day*: and usually upon no other day of the week. See his *Primitive Eucharist* reviv'd.

Athanasius again says, in his *Hom. de sem.* We all of us are permitted to labour on the Sabbath, since we are a royal priesthood.

So *Ignatius ad Magnes.* §. 9. Let us not therefore keep the Sabbath after the *Jewish* manner, and please ourselves in days of rest; for he that does not work, let him not eat.

Tertullian contr. Marcion. l. 4. *Christ* preserves the chief honour of the *Sabbath*, which is that of *rejoicing*, and not of being at leisure from work thereon.

Of the *Jewish* Christians themselves, *Eusebius* says, in his *Eccles. Hist.* l. 3. c. 27. *Rob. Steph. Ed.* That they keep the Sabbath and the *Lord's days*, in memory of the Resurrection; even as we also do.

I shall add the following authorities, as a farther proof that the Fathers gave the preference to the *first day* of the week.

O-

* N. B. That distinguishing *Rite* of the Eucharist, as it was made the Criterion of Christians; so its being celebrated on the *first day* of the week, seems to have mark'd out the *day of worship* to Christians, in such a manner, as cannot easily be evaded.

Origen. Hom. 7. in Exod. affirms, that even under the Law it was signified, that the Lord's day was to be preferred to the *Jewish Sabbath*.

Euseb. vit. Constant. says of the Lord's day, That it is truly the *chief*, beyond all question the first of days.

St. Basil Hexaem. Hom. 2. says, 'tis the first fruit of days, to which the Lord's resurrection hath procur'd the principal respect. And *St. Jerom* says of the *first day*, that it solely and only is the Lord's day; and that it is better than a thousand other days, whether they are common days, or whether they are those which were settled and appointed by *Moses*; as *new Moons*, and *Sabbaths*.

You say, p. 66, 67. "That if I by the first Christians mean, that they did not observe the Sabbath; the testimonies you have produced, prove the direct contrary, even so low as to the fourth Century. And if by *Christians* keeping the first day of the week as a *religious festival*, I intend, that on it they ceased from all manner of servile labour and employment, and spent it in acts of worship and homage to the supreme Being, till *Constantine's* time; his very enacting the observation of it into a law, and yet excepting all sorts of husbandry work, as lawful to be done on it, plainly evinces the contrary; and evidently shews, that it was only regarded as a *Church holy-day*, and not as a day of cessation from all servile labour and employment; and to be spent in acts of worship and homage to the supreme Being, by the direction of *Christ*." And you quote the law of *Constantine* in your note; *omnes judices urbanaeque plebes & cunctarum artium officia venerabili die solis quiescant, ruri tamen positi agrorum culturae libere licenterque inserviant.* Cod. lib. iii. tit. 12. lex 3.

I much wonder, *Sir*, how you could make such a supposition, as in these words you plainly do, *viz.* “ If by the first Christians sabbatizing, I mean, that “ they did not observe the Sabbath.” If you had turn’d to *p.* 57. of my Tract, and look’d over the *i. Sect.* of Lord King’s Authorities; you wou’d have found no room for such a supposition, neither have I any where said, that I did not believe with him, that the *eastern*, and perhaps some of the *western* Churches too, might in complaisance to the *Jewish* Converts, who were very numerous, perform on the *seventh day*, some of the same public religious services, which they did on the first day.

Neither is your other supposition on a better foundation; for I have no where said, that the Christians observ’d their festival in the same manner that the *Jews* observ’d their Sabbath under the *Mosaic* œconomy; much less, that they kept it so till *Constantine’s* time.—

I know you have remark’d in your note, *p.* 30. “ That I had defin’d the Christian festival, by a “ cessation from all servile labour and employment; “ and spending the day in acts of worship and “ homage to the supreme Being; which, you say, “ directly amounts to what you mean by *Christian Sabbath*.”

My words are these, *p.* 31. of my Tract— “ Conformable to this, the Christian’s observance of “ one day in *seven*, by a cessation from all servile “ labour and employment, and spent in acts of “ worship and homage to the supreme Being, com- “ ports well with every obligation the *Jewish* pre- “ cept can contain, that is either reasonable or mo- “ ral.”

Now, altho’ I have dropt the expression, *a cessation from all servile labour and employment*; yet I neither here nor elsewhere have said, that the Christians

istians have any such law, nor any other kind of authority, as *Example*, or the like, to oblige them to such manner of keeping their festival: nor cou'd I intend to be so understood, inasmuch as I know of no instance of *such keeping* the Christian festival.

Besides, I have only said that such a cessation from labour, wou'd comport well with every obligation the *Jewish* precept cou'd contain, that was either reasonable or moral; which I think is short of saying that the Christian festival was under such direction.

But if it shou'd be thought, that as much may be intended, and that yours is the obvious and first sense of my words; I own it to be an unguarded expression, and that I have said it without authority; nor dare I attempt to defend it.

On the other hand, I find that the *Jews* were derided by the Philosophers for their *Sabbath keeping*; even by a *Seneca*: *Septimam vitæ partem sic perdunt vacando, i. e. the Jews spend a seventh part of their time in doing nothing.* So *St. Augustin* quotes him, *de Civ. Dei.* 6. 11.

So also *Juvenal*, Sat. 14. *Cui septima quæque fuit lux.*——*Ignava et partem vitæ non attigit ullam;* i. e. the *Jewish* seventh day, is a day of idleness, and contributes nothing to any part of life.

And *Persius*, Sat. 5. says, Even whilst thou art celebrating festivals, (speaking to a *Jew*,) the forethought of the Sabbath makes thee look pale*.

But to add no more, I wou'd henceforward only be understood to mean by it, a cessation from such pursuits as are inconsistent with the nature of an holy festival.

I shall next examine the force of your conclusion, viz. “That *Constantine*’s enacting the observation of the first day of the week into a law, and yet

* See the Patriarchal Sabbath, p. 65, 66.

“ excepting all sorts of husbandry work as lawful
 “ to be done on it, plainly evinces the contrary.”

As you have only given us part of that law, and left what very probably did not so well suit your purpose; I shall insert the whole, as it stands in the *Justinian Code*, lib. iii. tit. 12. lex 3.

Omnes judices urbanaeque plebes, et cunctarum artium officia, venerabili Die solis quiescant; ruri tamen positi agrorum culturae libere licenterque inserviant: Quoniam frequenter evenit; ut non aptius alio die frumenta sulcis, aut vineae scrobibus mandentur, ne occasione momenti pereat Commoditas caelesti provisione concessa.

The sense of which, I take to be this; “ Let
 “ all *magistrates*, as well as the *commonalty* of
 “ cities and towns, and all *tradesmen* or *artificers*,
 “ rest from their common business on that *venerable*
 “ day call’d SUNDAY: Nevertheless it is hereby al-
 “ lowed, that the *Countryman*, or *Farmer*, may on
 “ that day be at liberty to attend the necessary af-
 “ fairs of the field, or harvest; *because* it often hap-
 “ pens that such attendance cannot be defer’d to a-
 “ nother day, which the corn of the field, or the
 “ fruit of the vineyard requires; such an indul-
 “ gence is therefore very proper, lest any of those
 “ *gifts of heaven* should PERISH, by omitting the
 “ present season.”

Now, Sir, will you from hence have us believe that Sunday was not in observation prior to this law of *Constantine*? Surely nothing but prejudice can hinder any man from seeing that this law was only a kind of *public dispensation*, plainly confin’d to cases of necessity: And it shou’d seem from hence, that the Christians in *Constantine*’s time had been too *Judaical* in their observance of it. Nor will the *Christian doctrine* condemn the law of *Constantine*, since it has expressly taught us, that works of ne-
 necessity

cessity and mercy, must ever take place of positive institutions, and voluntary observances. Neither can a rigid *judaical keeping* suit at all with the nature of a Christian festival.

You say in your other note, " That it was only
" a *Church holy-day*, seems plain from the observa-
" tion of *Friday* being enjoined at the same time, and
" with equal strictness ; as both *Eusebius* and *So-*
" *zomen* affirm."

This remark appears of no use at all to your Scheme ; for altho' both *Eusebius* and *Sozomen* may have mention'd the station days *, such as *Wednesdays* and *Fridays*, and the strictness of their observance of them. Yet I imagine you'll find that those were *fast days* ; besides, neither of these *authors* deny but that Christians at the same time had the *first day* of the week in highest estimation. Thus I think you must own this to be too hasty a conclusion, *viz.* that because the Christians in any age had more holy-days than *one* enjoined by law, that therefore there were *no one* of them fix'd upon a more substantial basis than the rest.—Neither will your observation prove, (even upon a supposition that they had with equal strictness enjoined every day of the week,) that therefore *Sunday* was not previously had in religious observance.

* Lord King says, they were called so in allusion to the military stations, or soldiers standing, when on guard ; and he quotes *Tert. de Jejun.* p. 651.



S E C T. V.

I Shall shew, that the *first day of the week* is, with the greatest propriety, observed by Christians, in honour of our Saviour's Resurrection; and that an *express command* is not necessary to justify such observance.

You say, *p. 51.* " That you scarcely cou'd have thought a *lay-man* under any temptation of handling the word of God in such a manner." The reason of your saying so, is this; I had said, *p. 40.* of my Tract, — that by his Resurrection, *Christ* had abolished *death*, or made void the dominion of death; as it may be rendred, *2 Tim. i. 10.* and that hereby he brought life and immortality to light.

To which you reply, by saying, That I, contrary to what we are expressly inform'd, say this: *for that DEATH was destroy'd by his dying*; and that I have not scrupled to quote a *part* of *2 Tim. i. 10.* and have left out; *by the Gospel.* On the other hand, you wou'd have me read the text thus, *viz. That he abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light by the Gospel; and that he destroyed death, and him that had the power of death, by dying.* By all which, you seem not to allow that these were effects produced by his Resurrection; otherwise it is no better than cavilling.

I reply, Now I humbly imagine that this idea of *Christ's* destroying death, or him that had the power of death, in your sense is very confus'd and imperfect; for neither death, nor him that had the power of death, could with any propriety be said to be abolished by *Christ's* dying, or by his death in your confin'd view of it. On the contrary, till the
pains

pains of death were loosed, by which he was held for a time, he, all that while must be look'd upon rather as a captive, or at least as one struggling for victory, than as a conqueror : and of consequence it must be his *Resurrection* from the dead, that actually gave him the victory over death and the grave, or which prov'd he had it.

Besides, what I have offer'd, p. 39. of my Tract, from *Acts* xiii. 32, 33. fully proves, that by the Gospel there, is meant the promise being fulfilled in the *Resurrection of Christ*. And we declare unto you glad tidings, (or the Gospel,) how that the promise which was made unto the Fathers, God has fulfilled the same unto us their Children, in that he has raised up Jesus.

Again, if you understand by Gospel, in that text in *Timothy*, the *New Testament* in a view abstracted from the event before us, to wit, the resurrection of Christ ; you'll find it very difficult to prove from the whole of your Gospel, that death was abolished, or that life and immortality was brought to light by it : and I fancy you must be oblig'd at last to take in this single event, in order to evince such a discovery.

Thus I think it does appear, that the temptation I have been under of handling the word of God in such a manner, was no other than the charms and allurements of truth ; which ought ever to have the approbation of all honest men, whether it be a layman or a divine, that is influenced by them.

But farther, I am persuaded, Sir, that your laying a greater, or even an equal emphasis upon the death of Christ, to that of his *Resurrection*, is in direct defiance of the following Scriptures.

Rom. v. 10. For if when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his son ; MUCH MORE being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.

Chap.

Chap. viii. 35.— *Who shall condemn? It is Christ which is dead, yea, OR RATHER which is RISEN AGAIN.*

Chap. iv. 25. *Christ died for our sins, and rose again for our JUSTIFICATION.*

Now if you wou'd have supported such an odd insinuation, you shou'd have produced some text wherein both the *death* and *resurrection* of *Christ* is mentioned; and where at the same time preference is given to the former.

You have also put that remarkable question, Why not the day of *Christ's birth* observed by Christians, since this made way for all the advantages we obtain'd by him?

But this is a very improper question; for the first formation of his body, in the womb of the Virgin, by the power of the spirit of God, was prior to this; nay, the very original purpose of mercy in God, was yet prior, which with more propriety might be said to make way.

But to put this matter to a short issue, I shall propose the following question; Why did not the *Jews* keep *Purim* on *Mordecai's* birth-day?

Methinks the day on which a deliverance is obtained, is fittest to be observed as a day of commemoration of that deliverance.

Dr. *Ed. Stillingfleet* says, "That we may see by
"the whole design of the New Testament; the
"great stress of Christianity was laid upon the truth
"of the *Resurrection of Christ from the dead*; to
"this, *Christ* himself appeal'd beforehand; to
"this, all the Apostles refer, as the mighty con-
"firmation of their Religion." See his Letter to a
Deist, p. 49.

I shall yet add, that the *death of Christ*, so far as it respected our *justification* and *peace*, borrowed its virtue from his *Resurrection*: for by this event, the
most

most finish'd evidence was given of his being approv'd of God ; and this is that *single Event* by which the doctrine of the Resurrection from the dead, and eternal Life, is clearly proved. For which *great event*, I wou'd ever gratefully bow my knee to the God and Father of my Lord *Jesus Christ*, who according to his abundant mercy, *has begotten us again to a lively hope, by the RESURRECTION of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for us.* 1 Pet. i. 3. —

In p. 50. You tell me, ' That my imagination ' about the reason of God's love to Christ, has no ' foundation, either in Scripture or Reason.' You refer to p. 38. of my Tract, where I have drawn this inference from *John* x. 17, 18. viz. " That it " cannot be supposed that the Father loved *Christ* " *merely* because he laid down his life that he might " take it up again : no ; the reason of his love was " rather because of that his extraordinary personal " Resurrection from the dead ; by which he wou'd " give the greatest credit and efficacy to his mission, " and incontestably prove, that he received his credentials from God." Now, I don't see but that you have at least justified the Expression, when you say, " That Reason will plainly suggest, that so " painful an humiliation, generously undertaken for " the good of others, must necessarily appear extremely amiable to every intelligent Being." For, surely this is more than merely to lay down his life to take it again : Nevertheless I here freely confess, that I neither think my own, nor your sense of the words, to have reached the design of our Saviour. I beg leave therefore to give them the following reading : The words in *John* are these, ————
Therefore does my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I might take it again ; no man taketh

it from me, but I lay it down of myself, I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again; this commandment (or power,) have I received from my Father.

The import of which, I take to be this; “As the great extent of power imparted to *Jesus* by his Father, was a continued *pledge* and *seal* of his being the only begotten, and most beloved Son of his Father; so the views he had in so freely laying down his life, *viz.* That he might by his Resurrection be authorized to confirm and support the doctrine of repentance, and remission of sins; or in other words, the reversal of the sentence of death to all nations: these his *views* discovering so great love to man, rendered him in such an eminent sense, the object of his Father’s love.”

You say in p. 47. “That if *Christ*’s entrance on *rest*, without a command, could constitute a Sabbath, then the *seventh day* of the week must necessarily be the day.” And in p. 41. you ask, “If in the grave the weary are at *rest*, and I allow that *Jesus* was in the grave all the *seventh day*; why should not his *entrance on rest* rather be plac’d there?”

I answer, That if the time of his lying in the grave, under the pains of death, can be prov’d to be a *rest* of the same nature or kind, as his *rest* from creation; there will, upon your Scheme, be some room for the question: but in the mean time, I imagine that this poetical phrase of *Job*’s won’t well suit the case before us; I rather think that whilst *Jesus* lay in the grave, the state of his humiliation and sufferings was continued; and that the very first moment of his resting, or being delivered from such a state, was at his rising from the dead: and as a consequence of this, that his continuance in the state of the dead, is no proper foundation for the observance

servance of the Christian festival, or if you will have it so, for their sabbatizing; except we must suppose, that the true way of sabbatizing, is to be as dead men, *i. e.* in a state of inactivity; or rather, if we may apply the Greek words strictly, *tas widuas parturientis feminae dolores*, *i. e.* the pains of a woman in travail, when she wants to bring forth; and which is translated *the pains*, *Acts* ii. 24. it will then import a season of the greatest and most vehement struggle to Christ; as if he was yet straitned till the cords were loosed, and the bands broken. If this, I say, may be thus literally applied, it will fully shew that that season in which our Lord descended into *Hades*, and his continuance there, was not a condition or state of *rest*, nor was his design yet finished; such painful struggles, and such earnest desires to bring to the birth, were not accomplished till his *Resurrection*; at which event he became invested with all power, both in heaven and earth!

Again, you say, *p.* 52. “Nor is it easy to be
“conceiv’d, notwithstanding all I have said on
“this head, (*viz.* on *Christ’s* rising on the first day
“of the week,) how the *Son of man* could be said
“to be *three days and three nights* in the heart of
“the earth, if he only lay in the grave between
“four o’ clock on *Friday*, and *Sunday* morning
“early.”

I might, for answer, refer you to a second consideration of what I have already offer’d; and have further told you, that as those scriptures are express, and to the point, it would have been but reasonable to have shewn how they are capable of a different sense than that to which I have applied them: please to add to them, *Luke* xxiv. 21. the two Disciples tell *Jesus* (as a stranger,)—*Beside all this, to-day is the third day since these things were done.*—

And *1 Cor.* xv. 3, 4. *For I delivered to you first of*

all that which I received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day, according to the scriptures. But *Friday*, I have prov'd, (and you don't deny it,) to be the day of his Crucifixion and Burial; *Saturday* then must be the second day, and *Sunday* the third of his lying in the grave; to which *Justin Martyr's* account agrees exactly, as well as the other antient writers.

I might add, that we are assured of the truth of our Saviour's Crucifixion being on a *Friday*, from *Astronomy* itself; by which we are informed that the 15th of *Nisan*, on that year, fell on a *Friday*, as Mr. *Whiston* has clearly shewn us in his *Chronology*.

Nevertheless, you may yet ask, how it can be said that our Lord lay *three days and three nights* in the grave?

I answer, I do not know that by our mentioning *three days and three nights*, it is even so much as expected we should intend three exact and complete *days and nights*; the idiom of our language does not demand such a strict and nice observation, in order to support truth; a few hours, or even if many are wanting at both ends of our reckoning, this don't render it a fallacy in any historical narrative we give of things. And I am informed that the nature of the *Hebrew Language* is such, that it requires the use of *two words*, to express what other nations intend by *one* alone: thus for instance, the *world* in their language is expressed by *heavens and earth*. So again, what we call a *natural day*, and the *Greeks* call a *ῥημέριον*, they, *i. e.* the *Hebrews* could express no otherways than by *evening and morning*, or by a day and a night. The text therefore which you refer to, *Matth. xii. 40.* only affirms that our Saviour was to lie three *Nucthemera*, *i. e.* part of three natural days in the grave, which is true he did; and,
as

as *Lightfoot* has shewn, is agreeable with the *Jewish* idiom, or their usual manner of expressing themselves.

Besides, the text you refer to says, *That as Jonab was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so the Son of Man should be three days and three nights in the grave.* Now *Jonab*, in all probability, was thrown into the sea, and swallowed by the whale, some time in the night, for he was asleep just before; and it is not likely that he was set on shore again in the night: however this be, there is no proof can be given that he was there three full complete days and nights; but he might be part of three natural days, altho' not longer than our Saviour was in the grave: And it is a great probability, from the circumstances of the narrative, that it was so. Hence it will be incumbent on you, before you are too severe with our Saviour's *Nucthemera*, that you shew that *Jonab's* was a more complete and perfect one.

What I have offer'd, I hope, is sufficient to prove that our Saviour's Resurrection was not only the most important event to Christians, but an event most proper in its own nature, as a ground of the Christians festival. I have before shewn, that the Sabbath is a repeal'd and abrogated institution, and that the *Apostles* and primitive Christians treated it as such; and not only so, but did actually observe the first day of the week as a religious festival: Whether this may convince you that we have sufficient warrant for such observance, I know not; but as I think it a truth, it would give me pleasure if it should.

You say indeed, p. 46. "That it is strangely
 "surprizing I should mention the *Jewish* Sabbath
 "as obligatory, in virtue of its being commanded
 "by God; and yet not perceive that this very
 "thing

“ thing, viz. the *divine command*, on which I lay
 “ the whole stress of the *Jews* obligation to observe
 “ the seventh-day *Sabbath*, is wanting, with the
 “ day I would have take place as the *Christian Sab-*
 “ *bath*, by a parity of reason. As if I could imagine
 “ this reasoning to be conclusive; The *Jews* kept
 “ the seventh-day Sabbath, purely in obedience to
 “ the divine command; therefore Christians must
 “ keep the *first day* as a Sabbath, without any such
 “ command. And how am I sure that the reason
 “ of the *Jewish* and Christian festival must be the
 “ same, viz. rest, any more than the day? More-
 “ over, if *Christ*’s entrance on rest, without a com-
 “ mand, could constitute a Sabbath; then the seventh
 “ day of the week, I have before shewn, must ne-
 “ cessarily be the day. But alas! no event, whe-
 “ ther ordinary or extraordinary, upon a certain
 “ day, can possibly constitute that day a *Sabbath*;
 “ but in all such cases, we must have an express
 “ institution for the regulation of our practice.”
 And in p. 51. you say, “ That it lies upon us who
 “ practise any thing as a divine institution, to shew
 “ where it is commanded.”

I have already shewn, under *Seet. iii.* That upon
 this your principle of the necessity of an express
 command, and of an express abrogation, you are
 all *Sabbath-breakers* yourselves, and not *Sabbath-*
keepers; for if the Sabbath be not repealed, the
Sabbatic laws of keeping are unrepealed also; and
 the one ought to oblige you as much as the other,
 since no event, either ordinary or extraordinary, can
 vacate express commands.

But to proceed; I have no where said, that the
 Christians must keep the *first day* as a Sabbath; but
 as a festival they certainly may keep it, and the
 practice of the Apostles and *first Christians* is suf-
 ficient reason for their doing so; as appears from
 the

the practice of all Christians in other cases, you, and your congregation are not excepted. For, pray *Sir*, what express precept or command have you for laying on of hands in ordination? What for confining the distribution of the Elements at the Lord's Supper to the Minister, (as I am informed you do?) and what for laying on of hands after Baptism? and I doubt not but that there are many other things, which you and your people practise in *religious affairs*, without any *express institution* or *command* for the regulation thereof.

That question you put, "How am I sure that the reason of the Sabbath, and the Christian festival is the same, *viz. rest*?" is quibbling: you know, *Sir*, that a candid reader can easily discern that I have shewn a wide difference between the reason of one, and of the other; the reason of one was the slavery and vassallage the *Jews* had undergone in *Egypt*, and a deliverance from that; the reason of the other, was the victory and triumph our Lord obtained over death and the grave.—— You say again, "That I allow that the *Jews* kept the seventh-day Sabbath purely in obedience to a divine command; but I wou'd have Christians keep the first day as a Sabbath, without any such command."

I reply, That I have said enough already, to shew I would not have Christians keep the first day as a *Sabbath*; nor do I think I need to scruple saying, that I have proved that they have sufficient authority for keeping the *first day*: for if we make the scriptures the only rule of our faith, and attend to the practice of the primitive Christians, we shall be obliged to allow that there is considerable weight in those texts of scripture which mention particular things, as practised by the Apostles, and as successively received and practised by the Churches after them;

nor

nor can I believe that the Apostles ever recommended any thing to Christians as their duty, nor as such, encouraged or enforced it by their example, but what was according to the will of *Christ*: In this view I apprehend the *Christian festival* stands. And from what I have offered, I think I may safely conclude, that I have proved what I proposed, *viz.* That an express command is not necessary to justify such observance.

I shall now draw some conclusions from the whole:

And, 1. I think we may hence conclude, that the law of the Sabbath cannot oblige Christians, even upon your scheme; for you have given up the *fourth commandment*, and by doing so, your *original institution* does confessedly stand by itself, without ever being once enforced since the Creation; but this, I am persuaded, cannot be said of any one *law*, either moral or positive, which obliges Christians.

But, 2. Whether you'll allow of this first conclusion, or not, I think I may safely conclude, that the Sabbath only belonged to the *Jews*, and is vacated.

3. It appears plain, that Christians have an express *rule or direction* for keeping of their *holy-days*; *be, i. e.* that Christian, *who regardeth a day, regardeth it to the Lord.* Rom. xiv. 9.

I shall finish with some passages of Mr. *Joseph Hallet's* *. “*We are not come to the voice of words, (by which the Apostle meant the Ten Commandments deliver'd by the voice of God at mount Sinai,) but to Jesus, the mediator of the new Covenant, Heb. xii. 18. — This seems to imply that the Ten Commandments are not part of the new Covenant, whereof Jesus is the Mediator.*” And in *p.* 173. “*There is no foundation*”
“*for*

* See, his free and impartial Study of the Scriptures recommended, *p.* 172.

“ for calling the Ten Commandments by way of
 “ eminence, the *moral law*; most of them indeed
 “ are of a moral nature, and accordingly discover-
 “ able by our natural reason; but there are some
 “ things ceremonial intermixed. *p.* 162. I argue
 “ from the promise in the fifth Commandment,
 “ (that the ten Commandments in particular, do not
 “ oblige Christians.)—The *land* here mentioned,
 “ is the land of *Canaan*, which God gave to the
 “ *Israelites* for their habitation. The promise of
 “ inheriting the land of *Canaan*, was undoubtedly
 “ made only to the *Jews*. And in *p.* 170. If the
 “ Apostles and the Holy Ghost had thought it ne-
 “ cessary, (as some good men now do,) for all Chri-
 “ stians to observe the *Jewish* Sabbath, they would
 “ certainly have reckoned up *five* necessary things;
 “ and have mentioned observing the Sabbath, as
 “ well as abstaining from blood, &c. If it be as
 “ these men think, the will of God, that all Chri-
 “ stians should observe the Sabbath; the observa-
 “ tion of it wou’d be fully as necessary as the ab-
 “ staining from blood. But since the Apostles do
 “ not mention the observation of the Sabbath as one
 “ of the necessary things, it is plain, that they did
 “ not look upon it to be such.”

Thus, *Sir*, I have, with the utmost of my ca-
 pacity, attention, and candour, consider’d the *sub-*
ject debated between us; and do humbly recommend
 it, in a more particular manner, to your conside-
 ration.

I am, Sir, with all respect,
Your most humble Servant,

C. F.

BOOKS printed for **D. FARMER,**
at the *Bible*, in *Pater-Noster-Row*.

1. **A** Guide to Prayer; or a free and rational Account of the Gift, Grace, and Spirit of Prayer. With plain Directions how every Christian may attain them. The 7th Edition, corrected.
2. An Humble Attempt toward the Revival of Practical Religion among Christians; by a serious Address to Ministers and People: In some occasional Discourses. The 2d Edition.
3. The Doctrine of the Passions explain'd and improv'd. The 2d Edition, corrected and enlarg'd.
4. A Caveat against Infidelity, or the Danger of Apostacy from the Christian Faith. With an Answer to various Queries concerning the Salvation of the Heathens, and the Hope of the modern Deists, upon their Pretences to Sincerity. All four by the Reverend *Isaac Watts*, D. D.

Religious Courtship; being Historical Discourses on the Necessity of marrying Religious Husbands and Wives only. As also of Husbands and Wives being of the same Opinions in Religion with one another. With an Appendix of the Necessity of taking none but religious Servants; and a Proposal for the better managing of Servants.

Plain Dealing; or, Separation without Schism, and Schism without Separation; exemplified in the Case of Protestant-Dissenters and Church-men: By the Reverend *Charles Owen*, D. D.